

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

In re:

William A. Rankin and
Shirley A. Rankin,

Debtors.

_____ /

Consolidated Case No. 06-13726

Bankr. Case No. 02-30596

Chapter 7

Walter Shapero

United States Bankruptcy Judge

William A. Rankin and
Shirley A. Rankin

Appellants

v.

Judith E. Levy

United States District Judge

Mag. Judge Michael J.
Hluchaniuk

Brian Levan and Associates, P.C.;
Commonwealth Land Title Ins.
Co., a foreign corporation; Joel R.
Dault; Progressive Title Ins.
Agency Co., a Michigan
Corporation; Paul Wood, deceased;
Karla Volke-Wood,

Appellees

Collene K. Corcorian,

Trustee—
Appellee.

_____ /

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [57]

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Michael J. Hluchaniuk's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") recommending the Court deny Debtors/Appellants William A. Rankin and Shirley A. Rankin's motion to reopen the case (ECF No. 52). (ECF No. 57.)

The parties were required to file specific written objections within 14 days of service. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); E.D. Mich. L.R. 72.1(d). No objections were filed. Instead, Debtors/Appellants filed a response to the R&R, in which they sought an extension "past March 31, 2020" because "of this corona virus that is spreading across the world," and because "[a]ccording to the news Courts will be closed for 3 weeks." (ECF No. 59, PageID.550.) Debtors/Appellants, although pro se, have proven themselves very capable of advocacy and of meeting deadlines throughout the years that this case has been pending. Although the physical courthouse has been closed due to the pandemic, the closure has not stopped the work of the Court. Moreover, there is nothing about preparing objections to the R&R that would require travel or violation of any of the Executive Orders set forth by the Governor of Michigan during the pandemic. Indeed, the request for additional time was submitted

during that time. Accordingly, Debtors/Appellants' request for an extension is denied.

The Court has nevertheless carefully reviewed the R&R and concurs in the reasoning and result. Accordingly,

The Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 57) is ADOPTED;

Plaintiff's motion to re-open the case (ECF No. 52) is DENIED; and

Plaintiff's response seeking an extension (ECF No. 59) is DENIED.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 26, 2020
Ann Arbor, Michigan

s/Judith E. Levy
JUDITH E. LEVY
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on June 26, 2020.

s/William Barkholz
WILLIAM BARKHOLZ
Case Manager

¹ By failing to object to the R&R, the parties have waived any further right of appeal. *United States v. Archibald*, 589 F.3d 289, 295–96 (6th Cir. 2009).